

R E M A R K S

U P O N T H E

P L A Y o f D O U G L A S,

I N A

LETTER by a GENTLEMAN to his Friend in the Country.

S I R,

I Send you, according to your Desire, a Copy of the PLAY, *DOUGLAS*, with some general Remarks upon it.

I am far from having an ill Opinion of the Stage, or Stage-plays in general: I think, good Plays, well acted, afford not only an innocent Amusement, but may be of great Use in improving the Mind, Language, Behaviour and Morals of the Hearers, and especially of our young People.

As for this Play, it is far from being an immoral one; on the contrary, there lie, dispersed in it, many fine Sentiments and moral Reflections well exprest.

But considering it, as a Critick; it is far from being a compleat Piece. It has not what can be properly called, A MORAL; neither is there in it A HERO; and as to the HEROINE, her Character is neither *natural* nor *commendable*.

The Sum of the Story represented seems to amount to this, a Lady marries, clandestinely, a Gentleman of a great Family, enjoyed him three little Weeks; he was soon thereafter killed in Battle, along with her Brother; she happened to be with Child: But being obliged to conceal that from her Father, she sent it off with its Nurse, and believed it was drowned in a River, on occasion of a Storm: She lamented the Loss many Years; but at last was induced by her Father, contrary to her own Inclination, to marry *Randolph*, a worthy and deserving Nobleman; but still the Lady goes on lamenting her Losses for seven Years more, when it was at last discovered that her Boy had been miraculously preserved; and scarce has she had the Comfort of seeing him, and letting him know who he really was, when he is cruelly killed by a Villain, who is also dispatched in the Scuffle; upon which the poor Lady turns mad, and drowns herself.

Now, what is the Moral of this whole Story? What good Meaning has it? I own I can see no obvious Instruction that arises from it; and yet I cannot but commend the Author's Ingenuity, in dressing up such a simple Story in such a Manner, as, in different Places of the Play, to move the Compassion of the Audience, tho' from the *whole*, taking it as *one Piece*, there arises no Moral.

Another Fault I find in this Performance, is, That *Douglas*, who is designed for the HERO, has done nothing that can make him be considered as a Hero.

While he was a Shepherd, he was sprightly, killed the Captain of a Band of Robbers, took a Liking to warlike Atchievements, and
when

when he is seeking after an Opportunity for these, he happens to rescue a Nobleman, who was attacked by four Russians. These are all the heroick Deeds that he did, before he was acquainted of his Birth; after which he is soon cut off.

The Hero of a Play ought always to do some very grand and heroick Actions, such as may raise a high Esteem and Affection for him: 'Tis from this that a just Sorrow and Compassion rises in the Minds of an Audience, when they see the Hero brought into Distress, or suffer unjustly; but in this Play, the Hero does nothing of such Moment, as can raise any great Degree of Esteem for him, before he is untimely cut off.

If the Author had not been in such Haste to dispatch his Hero, but had carried him to the Wars, made him destroy the Danes, and relieve his Country, then he would have done something worthy of a Hero.

The Author seems to have been sensible of this, when he makes *Douglas* die, lamenting that he had not fallen, as his brave Forefathers fell, turning with great Effort the Tide of Battle: But had it not been a more compleat Piece to have made *Douglas* rather *act*, than only *speak as a Hero*.

As to the HEROINE; the Lady no Doubt met with two great Losses, her beloved Husband, and her fine Boy, (this last as she thought;) but these Afflictions are not so uncommon as to merit a perpetual Grief and Lamentation; and when she was prevailed upon, tho' contrary to her own Inclination, to marry a worthy Man, how unaccountable was it in her to persevere in her sullen Grief for no less than seven Years, without giving her deserving Husband decent Affection, or complacent Kindness! When I read those Words of *Randolph*,

————— *Seven long Years*
Are past since we were joined by sacred Ties;
Clouds all the while have hung upon thy Brow,
Nor broke, nor parted by one Gleam of Joy.

I cannot but pity the poor Nobleman, and at the same time have a just Indignation against the Lady's unreasonable Obstinacy.

This incessant Grief of hers for her first Husband, may, by some romantick Readers, be thought a Piece of high Virtue; but I can never justify the indulging any Passion that is contrary to Reason, and can never answer any good Purpose.

A Woman may have such a Regard for a first Husband, as to resolve never to marry another; but if she is induced, tho' contrary to her Inclination, to marry another Man, 'tis contrary to all Reason, that she should not indulge him with some Gleam at least of Joy, especially if he proves a deserving and affectionate Husband; and therefore, I cannot admire the Character that our Author has drawn of his HEROINE.

As to her ruinous End, it being a natural enough Consequence of her new Surprise and excessive Grief, I make no Reflections upon it.

I am,

Sir,

Your most humble Servant.